UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,172	10/25/2006	Rainer Uecker	2003P13562WOUS	4104
22116 SIEMENS COF	7590 10/28/200 RPORATION	EXAMINER		
	AL PROPERTY DEPA	FAN, HUA		
170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH ISELIN, NJ 08830			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2456	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		10/28/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/574,172	UECKER, RAINER	
Examiner	Art Unit	
HUA FAN	2456	

	HOA FAN	2430	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 16 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar it, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		E FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrumer 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL	" 'UL 07 OFD 44 07	en - 1 - 10-1 - 1 - 10-1	
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. ☑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	Called
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor			cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		00.017,	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) $igsqcup$ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.11	16 and 41.33(a)).		
4. $oxedsymbol{\square}$ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	·	•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 16.21 and 23.20		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) rejected: <u>16,21 and 23-30</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other:			
/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/	/H. F./		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2456	Examiner, Art Unit 2456		
	,		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amended claim 16 and 28 recites "sending test message...to a second mail processing device assigned to a recipient address data terminal" where "assigned to a recipient address data terminal" is newly added to this limitation which raises a new issue to be further considered, therefore is denied entry. However, the amended part of deleting the limitation of "or in a second mail processing device assigned to a recipient address data terminal" in order to overcome 112(1) rejection will be entered upon further qualified filing(s) such as RCE.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

- 1) applicant's argument on page 7 with respect to claim 16 regarding the limitation of "assigned to a recipient address data terminal" is newly added limitation to the "sending a test message..." limitation, which raises a new issue and is denied entry, therefore the argument is most
- 2) applicant's argument on page 7 with respect to claim 16 regarding the motivation of combination is not persuasive because the motivation of combining the references does not have to be the same as used by the application. See MPEP 2144 section IV, "Rationale different from applicant's is permissible", "It is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by applicant".
- 3) applicant's arguments on page 8 with respect to claims 23 and 28 refers back to the argument for claim 16 which has already been addressed above.